UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,783	06/27/2001	Frank Bahren	Westphal.6313	9614

7590 10/05/2004

Samuels, Gauthier & Stevens LLP
Suite 3300
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110

EXAMINER	
CHANKONG, DOHM	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2152	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/892,783	BAHREN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dohm Chankong	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 December 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-6* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *7-25* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *9,11,17,19 and 22-24* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☒ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1> Claims 1-6 were cancelled in a preliminary amendment. Claims 7-25 are now presented for examination.

Specification

2> The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the use of the term "rfe 1918" appears to be misspelled. For the purposes of this Action, Examiner will assume Applicant intended "RFC 1918", which applies to address allocation for private networks.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3> Claims 9, 11, 17, 19, 22, 23 and 24 are objected to because of the following informalities:

a. The use of the term "rfe 1918" seems to be misspelled in claims 9, 17 and 24. Abbreviations should be fully spelled out in the claims before using the abbreviated term.

b. The use of the abbreviation "MOST" in claims 11, 19 and 23 should be preceded by the full spelling of the abbreviation before its use in the claims.

Appropriate correction is required.

c. Claim 24 – "...wherein the second address is derived by manipulating the <u>second</u> address in accordance..." – Examiner assumes that Applicant intended this to

read "...first address in accordance..." in keeping with the scope of the previous claims (see claim 15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4> The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5> Claims 7-10, 12, 14-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ford et al, U.S Patent No. 6.101.499 ["Ford"].

6> As to claim 7, Ford discloses a first network which can be linked to a second network, the first network including a plurality of network devices linked with one another and have

an associated first address for unique identification in the first network [column 6 <lines 54-57>], a method for generating a second address for each said device comprising:

manipulating the first address of each device in accordance with a mathematical formation algorithm to derive the second address which uniquely identifies each such device in the second network [column 7 <lines 25-64> | column 9 <lines 4-9> where: Ford's address formation algorithm manipulates the first address in two ways comprising of first, hashing the first address, then combining this hashed value with a network identifying portion to create a second address].

7> As to claim 8, Ford discloses the method of claim 7, wherein the mathematical formation algorithm comprises appending a fixed prefix to the first address [Figures 3A-3C | column 2 <lines 19-21> | column 3 <lines 39-46> | column 8 <lines 50-65>].

8> As to claim 9, Ford discloses the method of claim 7, wherein the prefix is chosen so that the second address is interpreted as a private address in accordance with the definition (*RFC*) rfe 1918 [column 3 <lines 39-46>].

9> As to claim 10, Ford discloses the method of claim 9, wherein the first network is a private network and the second network is a public network [Figure 5C <item 126> | column 2 <lines 43-61> | column 3 <lines 39-46>].

10› As to claim 12, Ford discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the second network is the Internet [Figure 5C ‹item 126›].

11› As to claim 14, Ford discloses a first network that can be linked to a second network, the first network comprising coupled network devices each having an associated first address that uniquely identifies each device in the first network [column 6 ‹lines 54-57›],

wherein each device of the first network also has an associated second address that uniquely identifies each such device in the second network to which the first network is linked [column 7 ‹lines 4-7 and 48-64› | column 9 ‹lines 62-63› where: Ford's generated IP address is equivalent in functionality to the associated second address claimed by Applicant].

12› As to claim 15, Ford discloses the network of claim 14, wherein the second address is derived by manipulating the first address of each device in accordance with a mathematical formation algorithm [column 7 ‹lines 25-64› | column 9 ‹lines 4-9› where: Ford's address formation algorithm manipulates the first address in two ways comprising of first, hashing the first address, then combining this hashed value with a network identifying portion to create a second address].

13› As to claim 16, Ford discloses the network of claim 14, wherein the mathematical formation algorithm comprises appending a fixed prefix [Figures 3A-3C | column 2 ‹lines 19-21› | column 3 ‹lines 39-46› | column 8 ‹lines 50-65›].

14> As to claim 17, Ford discloses the network of claim 14, wherein the prefix is chosen so that the second address is interpreted as a private address in accordance with the definition (*RFC*) rfe 1918 [column 3 <lines 39-46>].

15> As to claim 18, Ford discloses the network of claim 17, wherein the first network is a private network and the second network is a public network [Figure 5C <item 126> | column 2 <lines 43-61> | column 3 <lines 39-46>].

16> As to claim 20, Ford discloses the network of claim 18, wherein the second network is the Internet [Figure 5C <item 126>].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17> The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

18> Claims 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford, in view of the MOST Specification Framework Rev 1.1 ["MOST spec"].

19> As to claim 11, Ford does disclose that the first network is a local area network (LAN) [column 6 <lines 34-37>] but does not specifically disclose that first network is a MOST network.

20> The MOST spec teaches a LAN that is preferably implemented as a MOST network [sections 3 and 8]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Ford's LAN as a MOST network as disclosed by the MOST spec, so Ford's network can obtain the stated advantages of utilizing a higher performance optical fiber network is more robust and faster than a typical network.

21> As to claim 19, as it is merely a network that implements the step of the method of claim 11, it does not teach or further define over the limitations of claim 11. Therefore, claim 19 is also rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 11, supra.

22> Claims 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford and the MOST spec, in further view of Inoue et al, U.S Patent No. 6.163.843 ["Inoue"].

23> As to claim 13, Ford does not disclose a method wherein the first network includes a firewall as an interface between the first network and the second network.

24> Inoue discloses a method wherein a first network includes a firewall as an interface between the first network and a second network [Figure 2 <item 1b, 4b> | column 2 <lines 14-

20>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a firewall in Ford's first network to securely allow the transmission of messages outside of the first network.

25> As to claim 21, as it is merely a claim to a network that implements the steps of the methods of claim 13, they do not teach or further define over the limitations of claim 13. Therefore, they are also rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 13, supra.

26> Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the MOST spec, in view of Ford.

27> The MOST spec discloses a multimedia system for implementation in a vehicle [section 2.1] comprising:

a plurality of multimedia devices communicably coupled through a communication link to form a private MOST network, wherein each of said plurality of multimedia has associated therewith a first address that uniquely identifies each said multimedia device in the MOST network [sections 2.4, 2.5, 3.11.1, 4.3.3.1].

The MOST spec does not explicitly disclose that each of said plurality of multimedia devices has associated therewith a second address that uniquely identifies each said multimedia device in the public network, wherein the second address is derived based on the first address.

28› Ford discloses a plurality of devices that has associated therewith a second address that uniquely identifies each said multimedia device in the public network, wherein the second address is derived based on the first address [column 3 ‹lines 39-46 and 47-55› | column 6 ‹lines 54-60› where: the Ethernet address is equivalent to the first address, and the generated address is equivalent to the second address]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Ford's second address generation functionality into the MOST spec's multimedia network to simplify network connection, administration, and connecting to a network outside the private MOST network for MOST spec's multimedia devices [Ford – abstract].

29› Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the MOST spec and Ford, in further view of Inoue.

30› As to claim 23, the MOST spec does not disclose a multimedia system comprising a firewall residing on the MOST network for linking the MOST network to a public network.

31› Inoue discloses a method wherein a multimedia system comprising a firewall residing on a mobile network for linking the mobile network to a public network [Figure 2 ‹items 1b, 4b, 6› | column 2 ‹lines 14-20›]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Inoue's network functionality that comprises a firewall into the MOST spec's MOST network to inspect packets as they are leaving the MOST spec's MOST network and to securely allow the transmission of messages outside of the MOST network.

32> As to claim 24, the MOST spec does not disclose a media system wherein the second address is derived by manipulating the (first) second address of each device in accordance with a mathematical formation algorithm compliant with definition RFC 1918.

33> Ford teaches a media system, wherein the second address is derived by manipulating the (first) second address of each device in accordance with a mathematical formation algorithm compliant with definition RFC 1918 [column 3 <lines 39-46 and 56-63> where: the hashing of the device's Ethernet address is comparable to a mathematical formation algorithm]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Ford's mathematical algorithm in the MOST spec to generate an IP address for the MOST spec's multimedia devices to access a network outside of its MOST network. One would have been further motivated to perform this implementation as the MOST spec suggests that his multimedia devices need access to the Internet [section 2.5 – see diagram "MOST Open Model' with TCP/IP network protocol embedded in one of the devices], and Ford's method allows simplified network connections for network devices.

34> The MOST spec discloses the multimedia system of claim 23 wherein the public network is the Internet [section 2.5 – see diagram "MOST Open Model' with TCP/IP network protocol embedded in one of the devices].

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is (703)305-8864. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DC

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100